

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-20 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 18 have been amended. Claims 3, 9, and 14 - 16 have been cancelled. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicant submits that the amendments do not add new matter.

Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is objected to because of a typographical error. The provisional application is incorrectly identified as being filed in 2000 instead of 2001. Applicant submits a substitute declaration herewith, which includes the correct priority information, to overcome this objection.

Inventorship

The correct spelling of the inventor's name is IOFFE. A request for corrected filing receipt has been filed to correct this error.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because all box elements for example 100, 110, 200, 210 have to be labeled for ready identification. Figures 1-3 have been amended to include labeling on all box elements. Replacement sheets for Figures 1-3 are attached herewith.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 7 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,696,961 of Briscoe, et al. ("Briscoe"). The Examiner stated that

Regarding claim 1, Briscoe discloses all the claimed subject matter (see Figures 1, 3, 4, column 2, line 40 – column 4, line 10). Note that the claimed first application connected to a first and second databases do not seem to play any role in the way the method of claim 1 perform. The claimed interface module connected to the first and second databases is met by elements 34, 40. The claimed second application connected to the interface module is met by element 12. the claimed translating data formats from the second application and the first and second databases within the interface module to allow data to be processed without a local database for the second application merely reads on the fact that the method of Briscoe provides a middle layer between application programs 12 and databases 20 such that application programs and databases communicate but the databases are not functionally aware of particular operations of the sources of requests for database operations or of the sources or destinations of data (see column 5, lines 10 – column 6, line 61).

(p. 2-3, Office Action 4/22/04)

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,696,961 of Briscoe, et al. ("Briscoe").

The Examiner has stated that

Regarding claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-20, Briscoe clearly teaches the concept of flexibility in where the major components of the invention reside in the system (see column 6, lines 43-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed features while implementing the method, product and system of Briscoe depending on users' requirements.

(p. 3-4, Office Action 4/22/04)

Briscoe discloses

As will also be described further below, Bucket Mechanism 28 further provides flexibility in where the major components of Bucket Mechanism 28 reside in a system. Considering the data path to consist, from "top" to "bottom", of Applications Programs 12, the data extracted from the databases, the Sequential Query Language (SQL) queries, and the database, the mechanisms of the present invention may be implemented in a standalone system wherein the Application Programs, data, SQL queries, and database reside in a single system, such as a desktop or laptop system or a single minicomputer or mainframe computer. Likewise, the present invention can be implemented in several forms in client/server systems, for example, wherein the Applications Programs 12, the data and the SQL queries reside on a client and the databases reside on a server, or wherein the Applications Programs 12 and the data reside on a client while the SQL queries and databases reside on a server, or wherein the Applications Programs 12 reside on a client and the data, SQL queries and databases reside on a server.

(Col. 6, lines 43-61)

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that claim 1, as amended is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Briscoe. Claim 1 includes the following limitations.

A method comprising the steps of:
connecting a first application with a first database and a second database;
connecting an interface module to the first database and the second database;
connecting a second application to the interface module; and
translating data formats from the second application and the first database and the second database within the interface module to allow data to be processed without a local database for the second application wherein the first application is run with the first database and the second database within a data center and the second application is run, dataless, at an application service provider.

(Amended claim 1) (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that, although Briscoe may disclose flexibility in where various system components reside, that flexibility does not encompass the limitations of claim 1. Claim 1 includes the limitation of a first application run within a data center, while a second application is run at an application service provider.

In contrast, Briscoe does not disclose such limitation. While Briscoe discloses various combinations of locations for the applications, the data, the queries, and the databases, the applications in Briscoe reside on the client. Moreover, Briscoe does not disclose or suggest the

limitation of a first application run within a data center, while a second application is run at an application service provider.


For these reasons applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated, nor rendered obvious, by Briscoe. Given that claims 2 and 4 – 6 depend from claim 1, applicant submits that claims 2 and 4 - 6 are, likewise, not anticipated or rendered obvious under § 103 in view of the reference cited by the Examiner.

Further, given that amended claims 7 and 13 include the limitations of a “first application is run with the first database and the second database within a data center and the second application is run, dataless, at an application service provider,” applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 7 and 13 are not anticipated, nor rendered obvious, by Briscoe. Given that claims 8 and 10 – 2 depend from claim 7 and that claims 17 – 20 depend from claim 13, applicant submits that claims 8, 10 - 12 and 17 - 20 are, likewise, not anticipated or rendered obvious under § 103 in view of the reference cited by the Examiner.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 7/22/04 By: 
Tom Van Zandt
Reg. No. 43,219

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(408) 720-8300